Oldenburger Forum Fremdsprachendidaktik

Band 4

Herausgegeben von

Wolfgang Gehring

Die Bände dieser Reihe beschäftigen sich mit Grundfragen des modernen Fremdsprachenunterrichts. Erörtert werden inhaltliche, lernpsychologische und methodische Aspekte aus forschungszentrierter Perspektive. Durchgängige Bezüge zum Unterrichtsalltag unterstützen die anwendungsbezogene Ausrichtung der hier aufgenommenen Arbeiten.

Maike Engelhardt / Wolfgang Gehring (Hrsg.)

Fremdsprachendidaktik

Neue Aspekte in Forschung und Lehre

BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg

Oldenburg, 2010

Verlag/Druck/Vertrieb

BIS-Verlag
der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg
Postfach 2541
26015 Oldenburg

E-Mail: bisverlag@uni-oldenburg.de
Internet: www.bis-verlag.de

ISBN 978-3-8142-2188-5

Inhalt

Eva Ogiermann

Teaching politeness with Green Line New?

1 Introduction

The present paper evaluates the opportunities Green Line New offers to learn how to communicate in English in a situationally appropriate and polite manner. While the first part of the paper analyses the pragmatic input provided in the six volumes of the course, its second part compares the way in which various speech acts are represented in the course book with empirical data on these speech acts. The second part aims at establishing to what extent the provided input can be regarded as representative and authentic, which is particularly important in course books designed for foreign language learners, who have little exposure to the foreign language outside the classroom.

Research has shown that in a *second* language context pragmatic competence often develops along with lexical and grammatical competence and that it sometimes even exceeds grammatical competence (see Kasper & Roever 2005: 320 for references). *Foreign* language learners, on the other hand, often learn to formulate grammatically correct sentences without being told what communicative functions these sentences perform across contexts. It is, therefore, not surprising that EFL learners and teachers regard grammatical errors as more serious than pragmatic ones while ESL learners and teachers rate pragmatic failure as more severe than grammatical errors (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei 1998, Niezgoda & Roever 2001).

The classroom, with its limited opportunities for the communicative use of language, constitutes the main opportunity to speak the language for many foreign language learners. Classroom discourse, however, is regulated by the teacher and often takes the form of a three-turn pattern initiated by the teacher's question, followed by the student's response and the teacher's evaluation (Johnson 1995: 9). Due to the teachers' social status, their speech is characterised by an overall high level of directness, which is why "the teacher does not serve as a pragmatically appropriate model for the speech of the learners" (Bardovi-Harlig 2001: 24). Additionally, nearly all English

teachers at German schools are not native speakers of English and their communicative styles tend to include features of German pragmatics. Pragmatic failure, defined as the "inability to recognize the force of the speaker's utterance when the speaker intended that this particular hearer should recognize it" (Thomas 1983: 94), hardly occurs in an English classroom where the emphasis is on clarity rather than appropriateness and where both students and teachers rely on German conventions of language use.

The lack of attention to pragmatic transfer and the learners' stronger grammatical than pragmatic competence do, however, prove problematic when it comes to using the foreign language outside the classroom. It has been shown that "grammatical errors are least likely to interfere with successful communication" (Saville-Troike & Kleifgen 1989: 86). While they are easily recognised by native speakers, pragmatic failure is much more difficult to interpret. It is often perceived as impolite, but "the specific source of the irritation remains unclear" (Kasper 1997: 10). Paradoxically, the learner's grammatical errors help the native speaker to classify her or him as non-native and interpret them accordingly, while pragmatic failure, especially in the case of a proficient learner, is often attributed to her or his personality (Thomas 1983: 97).

Learner language is particularly prone to pragmatic failure. It shows a tendency towards literal interpretation, explicitness, simplification, and underuse of politeness marking (Kasper 1997: 3). Transfer from the learner's L1 may result in literal translation of routine formulae, which affects their illocutionary force and the overall level of directness. Teaching-induced pragmatic errors seem unavoidable when the teacher is a non-native speaker (with little or no training in pragmatics) and the learners receive little authentic input.

Considering the constraints on pragmatic development stemming from the structure of classroom discourse and the teacher's authoritative and non-native communicative style, the course book plays a crucial role in providing pragmatic input. Previous research has shown, however, that most course books "fall short of providing realistic input for learners" (Bardovi-Harlig 2001: 24), one of the reasons being that course book developers tend to rely on their intuitions. In contrast to grammatical knowledge, however, most pragmatic knowledge is implicit, so that native speakers are only partially aware of how they use language (Kasper 1997: 10).

Since the early 1980s, research conducted in cross-cultural pragmatics has amply illustrated the impact of the speakers' cultural background on their use

of politeness strategies. The framework developed in the Cross-cultural Speech Act Realization Project (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), in particular, has been taken up by hundreds of researchers and applied to numerous languages. Extensive research has also been conducted in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (see Bardovi-Harlig 2001 for an overview), including classroom research (see Kasper 2001 for an overview). While early research focused on speech act production (see Cohen 2004 for an overview), in recent years the range of pragmatic phenomena studied has been widened to include pragmatic features such as discourse markers, pragmatic fluency, and conversational style (e.g. House 1996, Evans Davies 2004). At the same time, there has been a shift from cross-sectional methods towards a stronger emphasis on developmental aspects (see, for instance, Kasper and Rose (2002) or the 2007/2 issue of *Intercultural Pragmatics* on "Acquisitional Pragmatics").

All these studies illustrate that even the speech of highly proficient non-native speakers carries pragmatic features of their L1, and there is a growing body of literature addressing the issues of whether and how best pragmatics and politeness can be taught (e.g. House 1996, Bardovi-Harlig 2001, Bou-Franch & Garcés-Conejos 2003, Rose 2005, Cohen 2005).

However, studies evaluating course books from a pragmatic perspective (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig et al. 1991, Vellenga 2004), most of which have focused on particular speech acts, such as complaints (Boxer & Pickering 1995) or requests (Barron 2007), show that the extensive work carried out in interlanguage pragmatics has had little impact on the development of teaching materials.

Despite the increasing focus on communicative competence, English lessons at German schools are still organised around the transmission of information rather than interpersonal communication, and grammar continues to be a key assessment criterion. Although communicative as well as intercultural competence play a central role in German foreign language curricula, these terms seem to be interpreted differently from how they are conceptualized in interlanguage pragmatics.

Communicative language teaching is broadly understood as a method in which "the identification of learner communicative needs provides a basis for curriculum design", and it is often associated with terms such as "process oriented, task based, and inductive, or discovery oriented" (Savignon 2005: 635). At the same time, communicative competence is viewed as being comprised of several components, one of which is pragmatics. Hymes' (1972)

model of communicative competence consists of rules of grammar and context-appropriate language use, while Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) define communicative competence as composed of grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence. Their notion of sociolinguistic competence comes close to pragmatic competence as it involves the knowledge of socio-cultural rules of language use. Bachman's model of communicative competence (1990) encompasses organizational as well as pragmatic competence, with the latter consisting of sociolinguistic and illocutionary competence.

In German curricula stating the requirements for the teaching of English in German schools, communicative competence subsumes listening and viewing comprehension, reading comprehension, speaking, writing and mediation. Although German foreign language teaching methodologists recognise the importance of pragmatics in foreign language teaching (e.g. Gehring 2010: 150–159, Haß 2006: 137–139, Edmondson & House 2006: 81–87), in the curriculum developed for the Gymnasium in Lower Saxony (2006), for instance, pragmatic competence is not mentioned at all. The word "situationsangemessen" (2006: 21, 27) occurs rather sporadically and the adjective "höflich" only as a component of the compound noun "Höflichkeitsformel" (ibid: 15, 23). The term "culture", on the other hand, features in expressions such as "Erfahrung kultureller Vielfalt" (ibid: 7). Intercultural competence is claimed to develop by recognizing the impact of culture on one's way of 'thinking', 'feeling' and 'acting' (ibid: 25). Hence, there is no emphasis on the relationship between culture and the way one *uses language*, as one would expect in the context of language teaching.

Given this negligible role assigned to culturally and situationally appropriate and polite language use, it seems that in order to provide sufficient input for the development of pragmatic competence, course book designers need to go beyond the requirements of the curricula. To what extent they succeed in doing this – while relying on intuitions rather than the empirical research conducted in interlanguage pragmatics – is what the following analysis aims at evaluating.

2 Analysis

The following chapters offer an analysis of politeness strategies and other pragmatic phenomena found in Green Line New (henceforth GLN). Although a new edition is currently under development, it will not be analysed here as only four volumes are available so far. Selecting the older version for analysis allows for examining all six volumes and the opportunities the course offers for the development of pragmatic competence. After providing a general overview, I will compare the representation of requests, complaints and apologies in GLN with empirical data on these speech acts elicited from native speakers of English, German, and advanced German learners of English. The analysis focuses on pragmalinguistic input, i.e. the linguistic resources for conveying particular illocutions (Leech 1983: 11).

2.1 Pragmatic input in Green Line New

Foreign language course books are generally organised around the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar, while pragmatic issues are addressed in a much less systematic manner. However, the best way of introducing new words and grammatical structures to beginners is by embedding them into dialogues, which are a rich source of pragmatic input. The characters in the first GLN volume, developed for the fifth grade, use various greeting and parting formulae, they thank and (Be)apologise, make requests and suggestions, comply with them and reject them. Most of these speech acts are taken up in the exercises, allowing the students to familiarise with the formulae by which they can be implemented.

Conventionally, indirect requests introduced by *can* are discussed together with ability questions (Volume I: 41, 42), making the different functions of this modal verb explicit. The expression of regret *sorry* appears in its function as a request for repetition or clarification (I: 33) and as a formula accompanying a negative response (I: 27, 42). The politeness marker *please* occurs frequently in dialogues, exercises, and even in exercise instructions, which are generally given in a polite way. Not only does *please* tend to accompany instructions formulated in the imperative, as in: “Please put in the right words” (I: 52), but occasionally even ability questions are used, as in: “Can you put these words into three groups?” (I: 65).

However, while volume I is rich in pragmatic input, it also contains an exercise (I: 75) that is likely to lead to teaching-induced errors. It consists in confirming and negating statements, such as "It is Tuesday morning and the end of the English lesson", to which a learner providing a negative response is required to say "No, that's wrong. It is…" While this exercise enables the learners to verify or falsify statements that reflect their own reality, the repetitive use of the phrase "No, that's wrong" bears the danger of creating the impression that it is an appropriate way of expressing disagreement in English. In face-to-face interaction, however, "No, that's wrong" is likely to come across as blunt and rude, which is why teachers doing this exercise need to point out that when expressing disagreement, it is necessary to reduce the imposition inherent in this speech act. It could be mentioned, for instance, that the use of an introductory formula, such as "I think" or "I'm afraid" enables the speaker to disagree in a more appropriate and polite manner.

In GLN II, the students' growing vocabulary allows for replacing some of the dialogues dominating volume I by narrative texts, which decreases the amount of implicit pragmatic input. Explicit input, however, is provided not only in several exercises and role plays on various speech acts (e.g. II: 32, 57, 63), but also in two exercises explicitly devoted to the issue of politeness. On the basis of a dialogue between a shop assistant and a customer, the students get to practice a choice of useful phrases, and are told that "Could you" and "I'd like" serve the same purpose as "Can you" and "I want" but are "more polite" (II: 48). The second exercise consists in re-writing a dialogue in a more polite way (II: 51), which goes beyond simply reproducing prepatterned speech as it requires the student to think of linguistic structures in terms of appropriateness.

Volume III focuses on providing information on different parts of Great Britain and, thus, contains less pragmatic input than volume II. Explicit input is largely limited to two exercises in the workshop section right at the beginning of the book. One of them points out the necessity of choosing "the right words in English so that you sound polite" (III: 8). A list of requests, suggestions, and refusals is presented along with several formulae that can be used to rephrase them in a more polite manner.

The exercise entitled "Use different words for different people" (ibid.) is the only one in the GLN course explicitly addressing sociopragmatic aspects of language use. Three examples illustrate that speech acts should be formulated

differently depending on the social distance between the speakers and formality of the situation.

The vocabulary section of GLN III includes an extensive list of expressions that can be used to communicate "In the classroom" (III: 182–183). Most of the expressions constitute requests, and while many of those representing the teacher's speech are formulated in the imperative, the students' requests consist mainly of conventionally indirect strategies. Since the teacher's speech is presented as more direct than the students', it seems that socio-pragmatic factors have been taken into account. At the same time, however, the German translations that are also provided are very close to their English equivalents and both are characterised by an overall high level of directness. Bare imperatives, such as "Do this exercise for homework" and "Read the text on page…" are representative of German rather than English classroom discourse, where a phrase such as "Would you like to read?" is more conventionalised.

GLN IV is devoted to the USA and contains longer texts on the country's history, geography and traditions, which leaves little room for pragmatic issues. The introduction of the American variety of English addresses some differences in orthography, pronounciation and vocabulary, but not differences in language *use* between American and British English. Pragmatic input is largely limited to exercises on giving advice (IV: 31) and making suggestions (IV: 32), and a section on stylistic issues in letter writing (IV: 62–63), where a set of 'useful phrases' includes the written variants of a few speech acts, such as thanking and apologising.

Volume V also focuses on narrative texts, though explicit pragmatic input is provided in two exercises on modal verbs, which appear in the revision section at the end of the book. One of them focuses on the use of the verbs *will*/*would, could,* and *shall*/*should* in requests and suggestions (V: 98). The other aims at practicing the verbs *ought to, should, might* and *could* by embedding them into formulae giving advice (ibid.).

The last volume of the GLN course, which is used in grade ten, continues the emphasis on narrative texts. The only section explicitly devoted to language use is concerned with written communication (VI: 51–52). The text "Complaint about Flight #SOS13" includes several expressions which constitute direct and indirect complaint strategies (see below). Apart from stylistic advice, a list of expressions is provided constituting written (mainly performa-

tive) forms of the speech acts of complaining, requesting, apologising, applying, inquiring, thanking, informing, etc. (VI: 52).

The exercise "Different ways to use 'will'" (VI: 17) draws attention to the fact that the auxiliary *will* can be used in questions as well as requests. Since learners in their sixth year of learning English can be expected to be aware of this distinction, this exercise would be more useful if it appeared at an earlier stage, preferably along with the introduction of the modal verb *can* which is also used in questions and requests, that is in volume I.

The exercise "Bitte – Please, don't say 'please'" (VI: 63), in contrast, is very useful from a pragmatic point of view. It consists of a dialogue including eight different English routine formulae which in German could all be expressed by *bitte*. This exercise turns the students' attention to the non-equivalence of semantic meaning and pragmatic function and to the possibility of sounding inappropriate when producing grammatically correct sentences whose literal German equivalents are polite.

On the whole, it can be concluded that although all six volumes offer implicit and/or explicit pragmatic input, it is not systematic, and it decreases with the learner's increasing proficiency. While volumes I and II contain numerous dialogues, starting from book III on, the focus moves from communication to narration. The reliance on original texts in practicing the introduced grammatical structures and vocabulary leaves little room for studying spoken interaction. In addition, the units devoted to communication in volumes IV and VI focus on its written rather than spoken form.

The lack of systematic pragmatic input matching the developing grammatical competence is problematic since "input frequency plays a particularly important role in pragmatics" (Kasper & Roever 2005: 318). Pragmatic knowledge needs to be built up incrementally and continuously. In GLN, however, most of the pragmatic input appears at an early stage. More complex formulations, which require the knowledge of certain vocabulary items and grammatical structures, are not covered – and still problematic even for advanced learners, as will be illustrated by my empirical data in the next chapter.

2.2 Course book vs. empirical data

This chapter compares the representation of requests, complaints and apologies in GLN with empirical data collected on these speech acts. What makes English requests particularly difficult to learn is the broad range of linguistic

means for expressing indirectness and modifying the imposition of directive speech acts in English. The main difficulty in formulating complaints, in contrast, lies in their low degree of routinisation, increasing the danger of negative transfer. Apologies appear largely unproblematic as they are associated with a limited range of formulaic expressions. However, the formulation of indirect strategies, particularly those used to negotiate one's guilt, is highly culture-specific.

The data were collected by means of a discourse completion test, i.e. a questionnaire consisting of scenarios to which the informants are requested to respond and thereby produce the speech act under investigation. The present paper refers to responses to a situation in which 1) the speaker cannot attend a lecture and asks a fellow student if she or he can copy his notes (request), 2) the speaker has given a book to a friend and gets it back in a bad condition (complaint), and a situation in which 3) the speaker receives a complaint about a loud party she or he had given the previous night (apology).

The responses were collected from three different groups: 100 adult native speakers of English, 100 adult native speakers of German, and 50 German university students of English philology. A contrastive analysis of the speech acts produced by native speakers of English and German provides valuable insights into potential difficulties German learners of English may experience in conveying politeness in their L2. The learner data, on the other hand, illustrate instances of pragmatic transfer and other areas in need of instruction.

Requests are the most frequent speech act in GLN and their representation is more varied than that of complaints and apologies. I have identified the following strategies:

Please send me information. (VI: 52)

Will you ask about a job for me, please? (VI: 17)

Can I have something to drink, please? (II: 57)

Could you show me something different? (II: 48)

I'd like a pair of black shoes, please. (II: 48)

Have you got a pen? (I: 27)

What have you got to drink? (III: 8)

Imperative constructions occur without modification and with the politeness marker *please*. Conventionally, indirect requests are introduced by *will* and,

more frequently, *can*. The modal verb *can* also appears in the conditional (*could*), and with the speaker's (*can I*) and the hearer's (*can you*) perspective. Want statements are represented by utterances starting with *I'd like*, while the use of *I want* is discouraged. The list further includes two off record requests which can be both classified as availability questions.

The high frequency with which ability questions introduced by *can* and *could* occur in GLN is paralleled by a strong preference for this request strategy in my data. However, the English responses also include a broad range of consultative devices, often embedded in if-clauses, such as:

Is it OK/alright/cool – if I borrow/to borrow

Would it be OK/alright/would you mind – if I borrowed

Is there any chance/do you think – I can/could borrow

I don't suppose/I was wondering if – I could borrow

These syntactically complex constructions are underrepresented in my L2 data and they seem to pose difficulties even to advanced learners of English, as illustrated by the following examples:

Would you mind me to get your notes to copy it?

Would it be okay for you to give your notes to me?

Ideally, consultative devices and the constructions in which they can be embedded should be taught along with if-clauses. This would enable the teacher to link the acquisition of grammatical structures with situational appropriateness of expressions containing these structures and to use examples that are more useful to the learner than sentences of the type "If it rained, I would take an umbrella."

Nearly all complaint strategies that can be found in GLN appear in the above-mentioned complaint letter, which includes the following formulations:

I am writing to complain

I wish to complain for the following reasons…

This is, to be honest, not the standard one expects from a national airline…

Would you please refund us the money we spent…

… we are doubtful about ever flying with you again.

If I do not hear from you by the end of this month, I will be forced to bring the matter to the attention of my lawyer. (VI: 51)

The list includes two hedged performatives directly stating the purpose of complaining and a number of indirect complaint strategies, namely: an expression of criticism, a request for repair, and even two threats. These strategies are far from being polite, and they are not representative of spoken complaints.

While pupils at German secondary schools are not very likely to find themselves in a situation requiring them to formulate an official complaint letter, they may have to express dissatisfaction in face-to-face communication, where the above listed formulations would result in a tremendous loss of face for both parties involved. This is why complaints tend to consist of expressions merely hinting at the offence, as in:

I'm sorry but I think that's my bag.

Hey, that's my bag! (V: 40)

Despite the difference in formality level, both complaint strategies merely provide information intended to stop the complainee from doing the complainable. Similarly, in my data, the most frequent strategy is a question inquiring about the state of the book:

What happened to my book?

Was ist denn damit passiert?

Although English as well as German respondents agreed in preferring this indirect complaint strategy, the responses varied greatly in the way they were modified. The English respondents tended to downgrade the illocutionary force of the complaint by adding formulae such as "Don't worry about it" or "Oh it doesn't matter" or by prefacing it with expressions such as "I don't mean to be picky but…". The German respondents, in contrast, were more inclined to use expressions intensifying the force of the complaint, such as "Find ich nicht so toll!" or "Damit bin ich nicht einverstanden". This finding confirms Evans Davies' results, whose German participants "were much more willing to pass judgment on the violators" than were the English speakers (2004: 218).

My German respondents also requested repair for the damage much more often than did the English ones. These features of German complaints were readily transferred into English L2:

The book looks terrible. What have you done with it?

My dear, that is not ok. Please buy a new one.

Interlanguage complaints exhibit the greatest amount of negative pragmatic transfer in my data. Since complaints are highly situation-specific, they are exceedingly difficult to teach, though it would certainly be helpful to turn the learner's attention to the necessity of using formulae downgrading the illocutionary force of complaints.

The apology formulae that can be found in GLN are largely restricted to the expression of regret *I'm sorry* and its short form *sorry*, the most conventionalised English apology strategy. The hedged performatives *I wish/would like to apologize* are introduced along with written realisations of other speech acts (VI: 52). The expression *excuse me* is presented as an attention getter rather than a remedial apology.

The distinction between *I'm sorry* and *excuse me* has not proved problematic in my data, with English native speakers as well as German speakers of English relying heavily on the former. However, pragmatic transfer consisting in literal translation of the German request for forgiveness *entschuldige(n Sie)* has been shown to occur at a less advanced level (e.g. House 1989).

The main differences between English and German apologies in my data appear in the way the respondents referred to the offence when downgrading or avoiding the apology. While the English informants regarded responses of the type "Oh, I'm sorry, did we wake you up?" to a complaint claiming exactly this as appropriate, the German informants preferred to look for practical solutions, as illustrated by the following responses produced in German and L2 English:

Sie hätten doch kommen können, dann hätte ich die Musik leiser gemacht.

You should have rung at my door yesterday, we would have been quiet soon.

While routine formulae can be taught and memorised as pre-patterned chunks of language to be used under the circumstances necessitating them, there is no way of teaching the culture-specific ways of dealing with individual situations. What the learner could be made aware of, however, is the general tendency emerging from the data on all three speech acts for the English respondents to merely hint at things and the German ones to explicitly name them.

While the above analysis has focused on pragmalinguistic issues, pragmatic competence is incomplete without the corresponding sociopragmatic knowl-

edge, which allows the speaker to use the linguistic resources in accordance with contextual factors, such as the social distance and relative power characterising the relationship between speaker and hearer. While the above analysis has shown that the pragmalinguistic input provided in Green Line New would profit from being extended and systematised, sociopragmatic aspects of language use have been barely covered in this course book.

Finally, pragmatic instruction should take into account prosodic and kinesic features and the impact they have on the production and perception of culturally appropriate and polite behaviour. The fact that there is an increasing use of audio and video materials with the Green Line course shows that the importance of (suprasegmental) phonological and non-verbal features in acquiring communicative competence has been recognised by the developers of teaching materials.

3 Conclusion

While the repertoire of politeness strategies may be restricted by a second learner's limited lexical and syntactic knowledge (Kasper & Blum-Kulka 1993: 8), foreign language learners often know the lexical items and grammatical structures necessary for performing certain speech acts, but are not aware of their pragmatic functions. Learners have been shown to "underutilize the pragmatic potential of available grammatical knowledge" (Kasper & Roever 2005: 320). Modal verbs, for instance, which receive ample attention in Green Line New and other course books, are underrepresented in the learners' speech when it comes to modifying the illocutionary force of directive speech acts (ibid.). Similarly, even though my respondents were familiar with conditional clauses, they have encountered unexpected difficulties when using them with consultative devices.

On the whole, my data show that even learners as advanced as university students of English philology transfer pragmatic features from their L1 and use a limited range of speech act strategies, thus confirming that it is essential to provide pragmatic input at more advanced stages. On the one hand, the knowledge of more sophisticated realisations of politeness strategies, which presupposes the knowledge of complex grammatical structures, is necessary for the learner to formulate his intentions as indirectly or politely as she or he wishes or as the communicative situation requires. On the other hand, it has been shown that there is an "inverse relationship between negative pragmatic

transfer and proficiency" (Kasper & Roever 2005: 320), with the learner's growing vocabulary and grammatical proficiency encouraging negative transfer.

While more complex speech act realisations are best taught alongside the grammar and vocabulary necessary to perform them, negative pragmatic transfer can be reduced by drawing the students' attention to pragmatic differences between their native language and the target language and to problems connected with literal translation of politeness routines (see e.g. Evans Davies 2004). As Kasper and Roever point out:

> For input to be acquisitionally relevant, it has to be noticed. In order to acquire pragmatics, attention must be allocated to the action that is being accomplished, the linguistic, paralinguistic, and nonverbal forms by which the action is implemented, its immediate interactional or textual context, and the dimensions of the situational context that are indexed by linguistic and pragmatic choices (2005: 318).

These requirements place a heavy burden on the teacher, who is the one responsible for equipping her or his students with the knowledge necessary to avoid being unintentionally rude. Accordingly, in order to provide school teachers with the necessary pragmatic awareness and competence, pragmatics should play a more central role in teacher training. This also means that it is necessary to extend the amount of time that future teachers of English are required to spend in the target culture. As House's study has shown, even though her students profited from both implicit and explicit pragmatic instruction, "the (initially established) difference in pragmatic fluency between those learners that had had a longer stay in an English-speaking environment and those that had not did not decrease" (1996: 245).

On the whole, the above analysis has shown that Green Line New, and even more so its new edition, not only fulfils, but even goes beyond the pragmatic requirements of the national curricula. Considering the scarcity of attention devoted to pragmatic issues in the curricula, it appears that they need to be improved most and first, for instance by adhering more closely to the Common European Framework.

In the Common European Framework, communicative competence is viewed as comprised of linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence (p. 13), and intercultural awareness is regarded as crucial in bridging cultural differences "in values and beliefs, politeness conventions, social expectations, etc." (p. 51). In explaining the source of inter-ethnic misunderstanding, reference is made to theoretical work on pragmatics and politeness, such as Grice's

theory of conversational implicatures and Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (p. 119).

Finally, course books would certainly profit from the use of empirical data, which are not only presented in the research literature, but also easily accessible on the internet (see e.g. the homepage maintained by the Center of Advanced Research on Language Acquisition). The internet is also a rich source of teaching materials on pragmatics, such as the collection of articles on "Teaching Pragmatics" edited by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor or the section on communicative situations and the pragmatic routines appropriate in them offered on the BBC web page "Learning English."

References

Bachman, Lyle F. (1990): Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen (2001): "Evaluating the empirical evidence. Grounds for instruction in pragmatics?" In Rose, Kenneth R. and Kasper Gabriele. Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge: CUP: 13–32.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen; Rebecca Mahan-Taylor (eds): "Teaching pragmatics." In Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs. Online materials on EFL and related topics. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from: http://draft.eca.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen; Zoltán Dörnyei (1998): Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. Tesol Quarterly 32(2): 233–262.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen; Beverly A.S.; Hartford, Rebecca; Mahan-Taylor, Mary; J. Morgan; Dudley W. Reynolds (1991): Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. ELT Journal 45 (1): 4–15.

Barron, Anne (2007): 'Can you take the other bed, please?' An appraisal of request representation in EFL textbooks. Paper read at the 22. Kongress für Fremdsprachendidaktik der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Fremdsprachenforschung on 5. Oktober 2007.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshanna; House, Juliane; Kasper, Gabriele (eds) (1989): Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.

Bou-Franch, Patricia; Garcés-Conejos, Pilar (2003): Teaching linguistic politeness. A methodological proposal. IRAL 41: 1–22.

Boxer, Diana; Lucy Pickering (1995): Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints. ELT Journal 49(1): 44–58.

Brown, Penelope; Stephen C. Levinson (1987): Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage. London: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, Michael (1983): "From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy." In: Richards J. C. and R. Schmidt (eds): Language and Communication. New York: Longman: 2–25.

Canale, Michael; Swain, Merrill (1980): Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics 1: 1–47.

Cohen, Andrew D. (2004): "Assessing speech acts in a second language" In: Boxer, Diana; Cohen, Andrew D. (eds): Studying Speaking to Inform Second Language Learning. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.: 302–327.

Cohen, Andrew D. (2005): Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. Intercultural Pragmatics 2(3): 275–301.

Edmondson, Willis; House, Juliane (2006): Einführung in die Sprachlehrenforschung. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag.

Evans Davies, Catherine (2004): Developing awareness of crosscultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. Multilingua 23: 207–231.

Gehring, Wolfgang (2010): Englische Fachdidaktik. Theorien, Methodik, Forschendes Lernen. Berlin.

Grice, Paul (1975): "Logic and conversation." In: Cole, Peter; Morgan, Jerry L. (eds): Syntax and Semantics. Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press: 41–58.

Haß, Frank, ed. (2006): Fachdidaktik Englisch. Tradition, Innovation, Praxis. Stuttgart: Ernst Keltt Verlag.

House, Juliane (1989): “Oh excuse me please”. Apologizing in a foreign language. In: Kettemann, Bernhard et al. (eds): Englisch als Zweitsprache. Tübingen: Narr: 303–327.

House, Juliane (1996): Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language. Routines and Metapragmatic Awareness. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18: 225–252.

Hymes, Dell (1972): “On communicative competence.” In: Pride, John B.; Holmes, Janet (eds): Sociolinguistics. Harmondsowrth: Penguin: 269–293.

Johnson, Karen E. (1995): Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: CUP.

Kasper, Gabriele (1997): Can pragmatic competence be taught? Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. University of Hawaii. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from: http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/ NW06/

Kasper, Gabriele (2001) :“Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics.” In: Rose, Kenneth R.; Kasper, Gabriele (eds): Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge: CUP: 33–60.

Kasper, Gabriele; Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1993): “Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction”. In Kasper, Gabriele; Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (eds): Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford: OUP, 3–17.

Kasper, Gabriele; Rose, Kenneth R. (2002): Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell.

Kasper, Gabriele; Roever, Carsten (2005): “Pragmatics in Second Language Learning.” In: Hinkel, Eli (ed.): Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, New Jersey: 317–334.

Leech (1983): Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman.

Niezgoda, Kimberly; Roever, Carsten (2001): “Pragmatic and grammatical awareness. A function of the learning environment?” In: Rose, Kenneth R.; Kasper, Gabriele: Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge: CUP: 63–79.

Rose, Kenneth R. (2005): On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. System 33(3): 385–399.

Savignon, Sandra J. (2005): “Communicative Language Teaching: Strategies and Goals.” In: Hinkel, Eli (ed.) Handbook of Research in Second Lan-

guage Teaching and Learning. Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, New Jersey: 635–651.

Saville-Troike Muriel; Kleifgen, Jo Anne (1989): "Culture and language in classroom communication." In: García, Ofelia; Otheguy, Ricardo (eds): English across Cultures. Cultures across English. A Reader in Cross-cultural Communication. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 83–102.

Thomas, Jenny (1983): Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics 4(2): 91–111.

Vellenga, Heidi (2004): Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language 8(2). Retrieved on 22.02.2009 from http://tesl-ej.org/ej30/a3.html

Learning English. Green Line New 1–6. (1995–2000): Unterrichtswerk für Gymnasien. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf

Kerncurriculum für das Gymnasium Schuljahrgänge 5–10 (2006). Herausgegeben vom Niedersächsischen Kultusministerium. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from: http://db2.nibis.de/1db/cuvo/datei/kc_gym_englisch_nib.pdf

Pragmatics and Speech Acts. In: Center of Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts

How to… In: BBC Learning English. Retrieved on 22.02.09 from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/language/howto/